REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

In this reply, Claims 1, 14, and 28 are amended. No claims are canceled or added.

Thus, Claims 1-5, 7-24 and 28 are pending in the application. No new matter is added.

Each issue raised in the Office action mailed June 9, 2010 is addressed below.

I. ISSUES RELATING TO PRIOR ART

A. SUMMARY OF CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1-4, 9-17, 20-22, 24, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Pat. Pub. 2001/0017700 ("Homma") in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. 2003/0065766 ("Parry") and U.S. Patent 6,725,300 ("Nagasaka").

Claims 5 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Homma, Parry and Nagasaka, and further in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/0046247 ("Iwase").

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Homma, Parry and Nagasaka, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,347,305 ("Watkins").

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Homma, Parry and Nagasaka, and further in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. 2004/0184108 ("Takano").

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Homma, Parry and Nagasaka, and further in view of WO 01/40907 ("Carter").

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Homma, Parry and Nagasaka, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,347,306 ("Swart").

B. CLAIMS 1-4, 9-17, 20-22, 24, AND 28 --- 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 9-17, 20-22, 24, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Homma, in view of Parry and Nagasaka. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Current Claim 1 recites the following (emphasis added):

> A multifunction peripheral configured to perform the steps of:
> requesting first device-related information from a network device over a network, wherein the first device-related information includes meter-reading information;
> receiving the first device-related information from the network device over the network;
> obtaining multifunction peripheral information, wherein the obtaining multifunction peripheral information includes reading a meter of the multifunction peripheral;
> **generating a device-related report based at least in part on (a) said first device-related information including meter-reading information received from the network device over the network, combined with (b) the multifunction peripheral information obtained from the multifunction peripheral**; and
> sending said device-related report to a recipient device, wherein the recipient device is separate from both the network device and the multifunction peripheral,
> wherein the multifunction peripheral further comprises a hypertext transfer protocol module and wherein the multifunction peripheral is configured to perform the step of sending said device-related report to the recipient device by sending said device-related report to the recipient device via hypertext transfer protocol using the hypertext transfer protocol module.

Current Claim 1 recites the feature "generating a device-related report based at least in part on (a) said **first device-related information** received from the network device over

the network including meter-reading information, **combined with** (b) the **multifunction peripheral information** obtained from the multifunction peripheral" and makes explicit the claimed multifunction peripheral is configured to generate a device related report based in part on information received over a network, combined with information generated from its own operation. Independent Claim 28 recites the same or a similar feature.

No combination of references discloses or suggests Applicants' claimed feature quoted above. Homma discloses a peripheral device control system that generates history information regarding its operation, and transmits this history information to an information processing apparatus. Homma at paragraphs [0009]-[0013]. As admitted in the Office action at pages 4-5, Homma fails to disclose or suggest the peripheral device control system receives information from another device, then combines the received information into the history information of the peripheral device control system, and finally sends the combined information to the information processing apparatus.

Parry too fails to teach or disclose the peripheral device control system receives information from another device, then incorporates the received information into the history information of the peripheral device control system, and finally sends the combined information to the information processing apparatus. In Parry, imaging devices each send usage data to a "management facility." The management facility may be a "master imaging device." See paragraph [0017]. The management facility "collects the physical location data and usage information from and for the individual imaging devices 202." See paragraph [0019].

Significantly, even if the management facility is a master imagining device, nowhere does Parry disclose or suggest the master imagining device incorporate its own usage data into the data it collects from other imaging devices. For example, such usage data is missing from the usage data summaries illustrated in the box representing management facility 210 in Figure 2.

The addition of Nagasaka fails to cure the deficiencies of Homma and Parry, as the creation of a so-called "virtual copying machine" as disclosed by Nagasaka merely allows separate physical components to act together as a virtual MFP. No combination of one or more of the remaining references {Iwase, Watkins, Takano, Carter, Swart} cures the defects identified with respect to current independent Claims 1 and 28 above.

Accordingly, each of these claims is patentable at least for the reasons Claims 1 and 28 are patentable, and Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all claim rejections.

II. CONCLUSION

The pending claims not discussed so far are dependent claims that depend on an independent claim that is discussed above. Because each of the dependent claims includes the limitations of claims upon which each depends, the dependent claims are patentable for at least those reasons the claims upon which the dependent claims depend are patentable. Removal of the rejections with respect to the dependent claims and allowance of the dependent claims is respectfully requested. In addition, the dependent claims introduce additional limitations that independently render them patentable. Due to the

fundamental difference already identified, a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are patentable over the art of record, including the art cited but not applied. Accordingly, allowance of all claims is hereby respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

A petition for extension of time, to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, is hereby made. If applicable, a law firm check for the petition for extension of time fee is enclosed herewith. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

<div align="right">

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

</div>

Dated: September 7, 2010

_____/Samuel S. Broda #54802/_____
Samuel S. Broda
Reg. No. 54,802

2055 Gateway Place Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1093
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076